Theories, models and frameworks to understand barriers to the provision of mobility assistive technologies: A scoping review

Appendix 3, Table. Characteristics of included papers

| Authors and Year | Study design | Aims of the study | Population (n, characteristics | Country |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| McIntyre, Cleland and Ramklass (2021) [49] | Qualitative, Semi- structured interviews | To explore facilitators and barriers to accessible wheelchair services | 11(8 occupational therapists and 3 physiotherapists) | South Africa |
| Dorjbal et al. (2020) [48] | Qualitative, Semi-structured interviews | To identify environmental barriers and their influence on daily life | 16(SCI patients) | Mongolia |
| Jindal et al. (2018) [46] | Qualitative, Semi- structured interviews | To investigate parents' perceptions of rehabilitation and their information needs for their child with cerebral palsy (CP) | 18 (parents of children with CP) | India and Canada |
| Bhidayasiri et al. (2022) [50] | Review article | To present clinical viewpoints on the unfulfilled needs of wearable technology, such as exoskeletons and orthoses | N/A | N/A |
| Layton (2012) [38] | Mixed method | To identify barriers and facilitators to optimal mobility from the perspective of AT users | 100 (AT users. Neurological conditions) | Australia, Survey, Open-ended responses |
| Mairami et al. (2017) [44] | Qualitative, case study, Semi- | 1. To illustrate how AT influences stroke recovery and how the | 1(Stroke patient) | Malaysia |

Theories, models and frameworks to understand barriers to the provision of mobility assistive technologies: A scoping review

| | structured | environment might be | | |
|---|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| | interview | altered to facilitate | | |
| | | recovery | | |
| | | 2. To examine the issues | | |
| | | of AT affordability and | | |
| | | accessibility | | |
| Dwyer and | Literature review | To determine the | A total of 373 | New Zealand |
| Mulligan | | obstacles and enablers | participants in the 7 | |
| (2015) [40] | | for community | included studies | |
| ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | | reintegration as | | |
| | | experienced by | | |
| | | individuals with SCI | | |
| Seymour, | Qualitative, | To identify the issues | 21 (Community | Uganda |
| Geiger and | Focus group | associated with | rehabilitation | |
| Scheffler | | wheelchair provision and | workers) | |
| (2019) [47] | | the elements that | , | |
| () [-] | | contribute to or mitigate | | |
| | | these challenges | | |
| Gonçalves | Qualitative, Semi- | To demonstrate how | 6 (patients with | Brazil |
| Junior, | structured | people with lower limb | amputation) | Bruzn |
| Knabben and | interviews | amputation function and | | |
| Luz (2017) | inter views | express their limitations | | |
| [43] | | express their initiations | | |
| Arthanat, | Quantitative, | To explore how AT | 318 (AT providers) | US |
| Elsaesser and | Survey | providers perceive their | 310 (111 providers) | |
| Bauer (2017) | Burvey | education and training, | | |
| [42] | | the use of evidence and | | |
| [72] | | guidelines, financing | | |
| | | policies. | | |
| Gowran et al. | Position Paper | To examine the global | N/A | N/A |
| (2021) [23] | 1 osmon 1 aper | challenges related to | IV/A | IV/A |
| (2021) [23] | | wheelchair accessibility | | |
| Steel and | Feature Article | An exploration of the | N/A | Australia |
| Layton | 1 catule Afficie | complexities of AT | 11/11 | Musualla |
| (2016) [41] | | provision in Australia | | |
| Widehammar | Qualitative, | An exploration of how | 14(AT users) | Sweden |
| et al. (2020) | Semi-structured | users' experiences of | 17(A1 uscis) | Swedell |
| ` , | | _ | | |
| [45] | interviews | power mobility products | | |

Theories, models and frameworks to understand barriers to the provision of mobility assistive technologies: A scoping review

| | | are influenced by environmental factors | | |
|--|---|--|--|-------------------|
| Hammel et al. (2013) [39] | Qualitative, multiple case study, Focus groups | Multiple stakeholders' perspectives, issues, and priorities related to accessing, using, and evaluating MATs | 65(45 AT users, 10 caregivers, 10 service providers) | USA and Canada |
| Serres- Lafontaine et al. (2023) [51] | Qualitative, photovoice method | To study how peer training affects social involvement | 10 Wheelchair users (SCI patients) | Tanzania |
| Oskar et al. (2011) [22] | A postal questionnaire | To explore and assess the experiences of active wheelchair prescribers under the regulations and provisions set by local Swedish governments | 278 prescribers | Sweden |
| Smith et al. (2016) [52] | Review article | To investigate the determinants influencing participation among wheelchair users | 35 studies were included | N/A |
| Nabizadeh et al., (2023) [16] | Qualitative, Semi- structured interviews | To explore barriers and facilitators to prosthetic services for lower limb amputees | 29 individuals with lower limb amputation | Iran |